REMARKS

1.   In response to the final Office Action mailed February 1, 2006, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. Claims 1-4, 6-14 and 16-19 were last presented for examination. In the outstanding Office Action, all pending claims were rejected. Claims 1, 14, and 17 have been amended. Claims 7-8 have been canceled. No claims have been added in this paper. Thus, upon entry of this paper, claims 1-4, 9-14 and 16-19 will be pending in this application. Of these fourteen (14) claims, three (3) claims (claim 1, 14 and 17) are independent. Based on the above Amendments and following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the outstanding objections and rejections be reconsidered, and that they be withdrawn.

Examiner Interview

2.   Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for kindly meeting with Applicants' representative on Tuesday, March 21, 2006. During the Interview, Applicants' representative and the Examiner discussed the outstanding rejection, the pending independent claims and Figures 3 and 4 of Applicants' disclosure. Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for his helpful comments. Applicants have accordingly amended the claims as suggested by the Examiner during the Interview.

Claim Rejections

3.   Claims 1-4, 6-14 and 16-19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,631,409 to Watson, *et al.* (hereinafter, "Watson") Applicants respectfully submit that these rejections are improper and should be withdrawn.

4.   As amended, independent claim 1 recites, in part, "displaying on a display a plurality of filter criteria, wherein the displayed criteria comprises a list of a plurality of status levels for user selection; receiving a user selection of one or more of said status levels displayed on the display; ...."

5.   Watson, the sole reference relied on by the Examiner, is directed to a system for monitoring communications that displays user-selectable filters. As acknowledge by the Examiner during the Interview, Watson fails to disclose displaying a list of status levels on

a display, wherein a user can select, using the display, one or more of the displayed status levels, as recited in independent claim 1.

6.   As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Watson fails to teach or suggest "displaying on a display a plurality of filter criteria, wherein the displayed criteria comprises a list of a plurality of status levels for user selection; [and] receiving a user selection of one or more of said status levels displayed on the display, " as recited by claim 1. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection for at least this reason.

7.   As amended, claim 1 further recites, in part, "creating for display ... a visual representation ... including two or more network segments each visually distinguishable from any other network segment included in the visual representation by an indicia, wherein said visual representation of each of said network segments comprises a plurality of icons representing network devices which satisfy said selected filter criteria, and wherein said visual representation illustrates connectivity of said displayed plurality of network devices and said two or more network segments."

8.   In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner relied on Fig. 5G of Watson as allegedly disclosing a visual representation comprising two or more network segments visually distinguishable from any other at least one network segments included in the visual representation by indicia. (*See,* Office Action at pg. 3.) As discussed during the interview, Fig. 5G of Watson does not illustrate icons representing network devices which satisfy user selected filter criteria, nor does it illustrate connectivity between these network devices or the connectivity of the segments.

9.   As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Watson fails to teach or suggest "creating for display ... a visual representation ... including two or more network segments each visually distinguishable from any other network segment included in the visual representation by an indicia, wherein said visual representation of each of said network segments comprises a plurality of icons representing network devices which satisfy said selected filter criteria, and wherein said visual representation illustrates connectivity of said displayed plurality of network devices and said two or more network segments," as recited by claim 1. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection for at least this additional reason.

10. Independent claims 14 and 17, as amended, include similar limitations to those discussed above with reference to independent claim 1. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 14 and 17 are likewise allowable over Watson for at least similar reasons to those discussed above. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections to independent claims 14 and 17.

Dependent Claims

11. The dependent claims incorporate all of the subject matter of their respective independent claims and add additional subject matter which makes them *a fortiori* independently patentable over the art of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the dependent claims are patentable over the art of record at least for the same reasons as those noted above.

Conclusion

12. In view of the foregoing, this application should be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael G. Verga
Reg. No. 39,410Reg. No. 39,410

April 3, 2006